



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

would their undeniably hard lot be softened, but the enemies of good government, religion, and social order would be deprived of one chief means of popular seduction.

"Yet we must not conceal that the deadliest blow of all has been given to clerical influence by the doubt, now almost universally entertained, of the morality of the priests. To such an extent has this weapon been brought to bear against them, that it would be hard to find an individual who believes in their moral purity!—hard to find, a single priest, who is not assailed on this subject by the mocking taunts, not of adults only, but even of boyhood. Nor is a justification of these taunts sought in proven transgression; priestly chastity is impugned simply on the ground that the denial of lawful marriage has rendered it an impossibility. But this is not all. Not only does the priest find himself personally exposed to derision on this score, but he has the pain of beholding how widely the assumed delinquencies of his class have contributed to open the flood-gates of vice among the once distinguishedly virtuous peasantry, inasmuch as the now gigantically increased immorality of all orders of society, is frequently justified by reference to the notorious lives of their spiritual guides, and the application of the proverb, 'like people, like priest,' forms the running commentary in every ethical discussion. Hence it is rare in our days to find a head of a Christian family, or even a thoughtful political economist, who does not deem the most imperatively called for measures for the prevention of universal immorality to be the effectual removal of all suspicions of priestly unchastity. The Word of God is now fettered by the vices, whether real or supposed, of those who proclaim it; and if a reform be not speedily introduced, by which, on the one hand, the priesthood shall be secured a suitable support, without being a burden on the poor, and, on the other, be freed from the suspicion of practising the most infamous and destructive vices; by which, in short, we clergy shall be restored to our proper position in the social circle, and enabled to re-occupy with honour our place in the family, the Church, and the world—unless such reform be brought about, our hopes of usefulness are null and void; religion itself is given over to contempt, the hierarchy hangs on the verge of an annihilatory fall, and the State of its overthrow."

"Our humble and earnest petition, therefore, is, that you, Right Reverend Father, may be pleased, in conjunction with the high episcopate and the Imperial Government, to originate measures by which the evils which are now undermining clerical influence, and which threaten the ruin of both Church and State, may be removed, lest the people at large should be tempted to look to the revolutionary party as their sole hope, and be led to bless even the enemies of God and good order, if their political wisdom release them from so intolerable a state of things."

What a picture of Roman Catholic countries on the Continent does the foregoing document, coupled with the extracts from John Baptist Von Hirscher in a former page, exhibit. We earnestly trust that this remarkable movement may be the forerunner of a new Reformation, which alone, we are persuaded, can long avert the tide of infidelity from sweeping over Christendom, and hurrying into its terrible vortex the great mass of the educated Roman Catholics of Europe.

THE PROGRESS OF MIRACLES.

ALL France is honoured by another miracle. It occurred close on the fêtes of Cherbourg. A peasant girl, of the French Pyrenees, was engaged in her ordinary pursuits, when suddenly a figure appeared to her in a grotto, whom she had no difficulty in recognising. The figure was the Virgin Mary. That was one miracle; but it was followed by another. The grotto was very pretty before, but it now became useful. It had previously no water; now a spring was bestowed upon the inhabitants of the Pyrenean parish. Infidels and Protestants might not believe in the figure whom they had not seen, but the spring, at least, was within the grasp of their degraded intellects. A commission has been employed to examine the story. The members are charged particularly to test the water of the well. If it should have the slightest pretence to the honour, it is to be sold in bottles for the benefit of this district. Perhaps it may be more profitable to sell the water in another way. A village might be built there. A shrine might be formed. If the place have the slightest claim for natural beauty, that should not be difficult. Devotees would take the ground consecrated in this peculiar manner. That mode, moreover, of turning this girl's vision into permanent profit might have another advantage. It would compel the girls of other towns to examine grottoes with attention and care. It might elicit other miracles. There is abundance of space on the Pyrenees for small villages of pretty houses, with neat gardens, capable of being used as summer retreats, not only in the common, but the ecclesiastical meaning of the word "retreats." Penance on the Pyrenees would be lightened by the change of scenery to the inhabitants of Lyons or of Paris. They would descend to the car-

and labours of the plains doubly invigorated. They would derive health of body and of mind by their exercises, their meditations, and, if necessary, their stripes; but the latter would be light in these mountains. No doubt other and envious parishes and villages would establish rivals. So much the better. Too many miracles will not occur. Cardinal Wiseman is now in Ireland. There he proclaims the cold want of enthusiasm that freezes him in England. He sees it in the rigid features of the stolid crowd. Nothing will move them. His eloquence falls on adamant or flint, or, at the best, granite like that of the Mourne Mountains; but when he reaches Ireland he is refreshed by enthusiasm, by smiles, by tears, by fervour, and gratitude, and warmth—by faith, of which, nevertheless, he holds that Martin Luther made a bad use. He first learned the English language, he says, in Ireland; and he is like the old classic gentleman who gathered new strength and vigour always when he fell on his mother earth. The Cardinal returns to England from Ireland refreshed—a new man, with a store of vigour for England to wear out. It may be all natural and true; but, while France finds, Ireland loses, "the holy wells." They were places of pilgrimage there long ago, and they are now forgotten. The peasant passes around them behind his plough, instead of on his knees. Devotees do not look there for blessings. They do not go there in payment of their vows. Ireland retrogrades, France progresses. In the matter of holy wells France is in the year 1558 as contrasted with Ireland. This is a fact which Cardinal Wiseman should not overlook. To Rostrevor, or a Wicklow mountain, an event like that of the Pyrenees would be a fortune.—*Glasgow Bulletin*.

Correspondence.

ST. PAUL'S VISIT TO ST. PETER.—GAL. I. 18.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—If the theory of Peter's supremacy be true, it is truly astonishing that we find such little trace of it in the New Testament. Neither in the Acts of the Apostles do we read of the other Apostles receiving commands or instruction from St. Peter, nor do we find St. Peter himself in his epistles claiming any superiority; nor do we find the other Apostles, in their epistles, acknowledging themselves indebted to him for any part of their teaching. One of the few passages which a Roman Catholic may imagine favourable to his views is that which I have prefixed to this letter, in which Paul mentions that he took a journey to Jerusalem to see Peter; on which three words a lively imagination may build a very extensive fabric. But I think I shall show that these words, when taken in connection with the context, afford a very striking proof that neither St. Paul himself, nor those whom he addressed, had the least idea of any such superiority in kind, of St. Peter to the rest of the Apostles, as modern Romanists maintain.

In the first and second chapters of the epistle to the Galatians, the principal topic is, that St. Paul is asserting his claim to apostleship *independently* of the other Apostles, and by direct appointment from Christ; and he declares that his knowledge of Christian doctrine was derived, not from their teaching, but by direct revelation from the Lord Jesus, ch. i., v. 12. "I certify you, brethren, that the Gospel which was preached of me is not after man. For I neither received it of men, neither was I taught it but by the revelation of Jesus Christ." He goes on to say that on his conversion he did not go up to those who were Apostles before him, but went to Arabia, and then returned to Damascus; that it was three years afterwards when he first paid a visit to Jerusalem; that this visit was only for a fortnight, and that on that occasion he saw only two of the Apostles, Peter and James. That after that he went and laboured in Syria and Cilicia, and that all this time the Christians of Judea did not even know him by face, and that it was fourteen years after when he went back to Jerusalem and met the rest of the Apostles and heads of the Jerusalem Church, who, when he compared his doctrine with theirs, could give him no additional information which he had not possessed before.

Now, take all this statement in its connection, and with reference to the object for which it was made, and what inference are we to draw from the admission, in verse 18, that Paul made a visit to Peter? If all the Apostles were then believed by everybody to be of equal authority, everything is intelligible. The substance then is—"I did not derive my doctrines from the Apostles; for, for the first fourteen years I was preaching, out of the whole twelve I never met more than two, Peter and James, and that only for a fortnight." This is all very well, if Peter had only the same kind of authority as the rest. But suppose that St. Paul or his readers had heard the theory, that Christ had made one man the earthly head of His Church, and its infallible guide to true doctrine, how could he, in the same breath, assert that he had not received his doctrines from man, and yet say that he had gone up to that man and received his instructions.

Let us suppose that in the present day some one in China were to claim to have been miraculously instructed in the Christian faith, and to say in proof of such a claim that he had been for several years preaching the Gospel before

he had ever met any Christian missionary. But what should we think if he were to add—it is true I had paid a short visit to Rome, but I did not converse with any Christian priests there *except the Pope*. Roman Catholics would certainly feel that he did not attach the value which he ought to the Pope's instructions.

I don't know, sir, whether I make my meaning understood, so perhaps I had better try a more humble illustration. Suppose a schoolmaster were to ask one of his boys if he had written his exercise without assistance, and if the boy were to answer—"Oh yes, sir, I did it all myself; there was not one of the other boys near me when I was doing it except Peter." Would this be a sensible answer, supposing that Peter was the very boy whom the master knew to be most able and most likely to give him help? In such a case would not the master answer—"If you own to having had Peter near you, I don't care whether any of the other boys were near you or not."

I say that the present case is like the illustration I have used. St. Paul in trying to show that he had never availed himself of human instruction in order to attain his knowledge of the Christian faith, after admitting that he had had some intercourse with Peter, goes on to protest solemnly that he had not seen the other Apostles. "Other of the Apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother. Now the things which I write unto you, behold before God I lie not." Does not he show here most forcibly that he did not regard Peter as the sole source of information as to the Christian faith—the sole infallible guide to truth? Does he not imply, that if his object had been to get instruction from human sources, he would not have been satisfied with seeing Peter, but would have waited and taken pains to consult the other Apostles? And does not the confidence with which he writes prove convincingly that no such notions were then entertained about Peter as have been invented in later times? The Apostle is not in the least apprehensive that it would come into the head of any of his readers to say (as a Roman Catholic now would certainly feel)—If you own to having had communication with Peter, I do not care whether or not you consulted the other Apostles.

I believe, then, sir, that the whole passage is a very strong proof that the exaltation of Peter to a place high above the level of the other Apostles was utterly unknown at the time when the epistle to the Galatians was written.

I am, your obedient servant,
R. H. B.

THE HOLY FATHERS ACKNOWLEDGE THE POPE'S SUPREMACY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

(Continued from page 105.)

XIV. About the same time, Pope Julius thus writes to the Oriental Bishops: "Know ye not that it is the custom first to write to us, that what is just may be judged? Wherefore, if any suspicion of this kind attach to a Bishop, it is fit to refer it here. What we have derived from the holy Apostle Peter, this I announce to you, and not otherwise, as, I presume, you already know." (Apud. St. Athanas. Apolog. 2, cont. Arian. tom. i. p. 153.)

XV. Pope Julius further showed his supremacy: First, in citing the Patriarch, St. Athanasius of Alexandria, that is of the 2nd Patriarchal See, to a Council at Rome, anno 341, which his enemies, by their envoys, had sought of the Pope, as St. Athanasius himself testifies; and which is also testified by Theodoret.^b Secondly, in restoring both St. Athanasius and other Oriental Bishops whom the Arian faction had expelled, as Marcellus, Bishop of Ancyra, Asclepas, Bishop of Gaza, in Asia Minor, to their Sees, as far as spiritual authority alone could reach; that is, by a judicial declaration of their being the only lawful Bishops of them. This is testified by the Greek historians, Socrates and Sozomen.

XVI. Sozomen, speaking of Marcellus, Asclepas, St. Lucius, Bishop of Adrianople, and St. Paul, of Constantinople, says: "The Bishop of Rome having taken cognizance of them, received them into his communion; and because by reason of the dignity of his See, the care of all belonged to him, he restored them to their respective Sees."^c

XVII. And Socrates: "When Athanasius, Paulus, Asclepas, Marcellus, and Lucius had opened their cause to Julius, he, according to the prerogative of the Roman See, sent them back into the East with the protection of his letters, and restored to each of them his See."^d

XVIII. St. Hilary of Poitiers, writing to the same Pope Julius, says: "The best, and by far the fittest course, is, that the Lord's priesthood, from each and every province, should refer to the head; that is, to the See of the Apostle Peter."^e

XIX. To these positive testimonies of the supreme jurisdiction of the Roman Bishop before the middle of the 4th century, add that of the heathen author, Aunianus, who says that Constantius, the enemy of St. Athanasius, "earnestly wished to have him condemned, by the authority which the Bishop of Rome had over all others." (Lib. 16.)

XX. At the general Council at Sardica, anno 347, "The Bishop Hosius said: 'If a deposed Bishop shall fly to the most blessed Bishop of the Church of Rome; and if the same should think it just to re-examine his cause,

^a Lib. I. Hist. c. 13.

^b Lib. 2. c. 15.

^c Lib. 2. c. 3.

^d Lib. 3. c. 8.

^e Inter Fragment a 2, in appendix.

let him write, &c. But if any Bishop should demand his cause to be heard over again, it will be in the power of the Bishop of Rome to do whatsoever he shall think just, &c. The Bishops answered: 'The things that are said please us.'

XXI. St. Optatus, who was Bishop of Milevia, in Africa, anno 368 (or whoever was the author of his 7th book), says: "Peter was preferred before all the Apostles, for the preservation of unity; and alone received the keys of the Church, which were to be communicated to the rest of the Apostles." And in his 2nd book against Parmenian: "You cannot deny that St. Peter, the chief of the Apostles, established the episcopal chair at Rome. This chair was one, that all others might preserve unity, by the union they had with it; and that the other Apostles might not be setting up each his own chair; so that whosoever set up a chair against it was a schismatic and an offender. It was, then, in this one chair, which is the first sign of the Church, that St. Peter first sat, and in which now sits Damasus, through whom all the Churches in the world are united with us in the same communion, keeping correspondence by circular letters."

XXII. The same Pope, Damasus, thus writes to the Bishops of Numidia: "Hesitate not to refer to us, as to the head, all cases of doubt, as the custom hath always been."

XXIII. And the Council held by this Pope, at Rome, anno 369, declared that the Council of Ariminum, in anno 359 (which was ratified by more than 400 Bishops), had no force, because it wanted the sanction of the Bishop of Rome.¹

XXIV. The Council of Constantinople (called the 2nd general Council), anno 381, in their epistle to Pope Damasus, thank him for calling them to a Council, "as his members."² And Damasus, in his answer, calls them "his most honoured children."³

XXV. This Pope further showed his supremacy in deposing Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople.⁴

(To be continued.)

[XIV. We have more than once pointed out that there are two matters which should ever be kept distinct—viz., the conduct of Popes claiming superior power, and that of other Bishops yielding to it. The latter would be of great weight; the former is of very little. That the Bishops of Rome never let any opportunity slip of forwarding their own cause, and encroaching on the liberties and privileges of others, we do not deny. The temporary success of the Arian party in the East, in opposition to Athanasius, afforded a favourable opportunity to Pope Julius for adding to the importance of his own see; and it is true that he did write to the Bishops of the East rebuking them for their conduct, and alleging "that it was customary first to write to him, that what is just might be judged." That he had no idea, however, of any other judicial power than that of a Council is plain from the context; for, a few lines before, he says, "It ought to have been decided according to the ecclesiastical canon, and you ought to have written to us all that what is just should be decided by all." The important matter, however, is not what privileges Pope Julius claimed, but how the claim was treated. Fortunately, both Socrates and Sozomen leave us in no doubt as to the matter. Socrates, Book II, ch. 15, says, "They assembled themselves in council at Antioch, and dictated a reply to his letters, as the expression of the unanimous feeling of the whole synod. 'It was not his province, they said, to take cognizance of their decisions in reference to the expulsion of any Bishops from their Churches, seeing that they had not opposed themselves to him, when Novatus was ejected from the Church.' Such were the terms of the Eastern Bishops' disclaimer of the right of interference of Julius, Bishop of Rome."

Sozomen, Book III, ch. 8 (p. 114), states the purport of their letter more fully, thus—"The Bishops were highly indignant at this letter (of Julius), and they assembled themselves at Antioch, and framed a reply to Julius, replete with elegance and the graces of rhetoric, but couched in a tone of irony and defiance. They confessed, in this epistle, that the Church of Rome was entitled to universal honour, because it had been founded by the Apostles, and had enjoyed the rank of a Metropolitan Church from the first preaching of religion; although those who first propagated a knowledge of Christian doctrine in their city came from the East. They added, that the second place, in point of honour, ought not to be assigned to them, merely on account of the smallness of their city, and of their numerical inferiority; for, that with respect to zeal and firmness, they surpassed others. They called Julius to account for having admitted Athanasius into communion, and expressed their indignation against him

for having insulted their synod and abrogated their decrees; and they reprehended his conduct, because, they said, it was opposed to justice and to the canons of the Church. After these complaints and protestations, they proceeded to state that they were willing to continue on terms of amity and communion with Julius, provided that he would sanction the deposition of the Bishops whom they had expelled, and the ordination of those whom they had elected in their stead, but that unless he would accede to their terms, they should have recourse to hostility."

That the Oriental Bishops had no idea whatever that the Bishops of Rome were, or ever claimed to be, their superiors, much less the divinely constituted supreme head of the Universal Church, is plain from this letter; and though it is true that in point of doctrine they were in error, the question here was not one of doctrine, but of Church discipline and ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and turned on whether or not a certain custom existed in the Church. Pope Julius grounded his complaint on the breach of an ancient custom, which the Oriental Bishops repudiated as untrue, and contrary to the canons.

XV. It is not true that Pope Julius showed his supremacy by citing Athanasius to a Council at Rome. Athanasius had been expelled from Alexandria by the weak-minded Emperor Constantius, who had imbibed the doctrine of the Arians. Sozomen (lib. iii. ch. 8) says: "Athanasius on leaving Alexandria fled to Rome." And Dupin adds "not as an appellant, but merely out of fear of the violence of his enemies."¹ Socrates also (Book ii, ch. 17) says, "When Julius, Bishop of Rome, was apprized of these fresh machinations of the Arians against Athanasius, and had also received the letter of the then deceased Eusebius, he invited the persecuted prelate to come to him, having ascertained where he was secreted." The truth, therefore, is simply this—Athanasius, whose cause Julius had espoused, came voluntarily, in the hope of protection. His calumniators, whether cited or not, refused to attend or submit to Julius's jurisdiction. Dupin (Eccl. Hist., vol. i. p. 170) states that the Eusebians (i. e., the opponents of Athanasius) endeavoured to render Pope Julius favourable to them by offering him the arbitration of all their differences with St. Athanasius. But this Pope having accepted their offer, and summoned them to come to a Council, they refused it."²

XVI. XVII. We have already stated our reasons for not putting implicit faith in the accuracy of the copies which have come down to us of the summaries of ecclesiastical history by Sozomen and Socrates, where passages may have easily crept from the marginal notes of Roman transcribers into the text. As to Pope Julius having restored Marcellus, Asclepas, Lucius, and Paul of Constantinople, and sent them back to their Sees, it is at best an exaggeration of the truth, which Dr. G. seems to admit in the preceding paragraph XV., where he says, "As far as spiritual authority alone could reach;" for so far were these Bishops from being restored to their Sees by Pope Julius in 341 or 342, that it was not till five years afterwards, that their sentence of absolution was pronounced, A.D. 347, at the Council of Sardica, if any faith can be placed in the records of that Council; which we shall probably discuss on some other occasion. Dupin, in his treatise on the ancient discipline of the Church, shows clearly also that Pope Julius and his Synod did not pronounce any decree for restitution; but merely, having heard Athanasius's apology, took him into communion, and held him to be a Bishop.³

XVIII. Here Dr. Geraghty inaccurately cites as an epistle of St. Hilary's to Pope Julius, what was in reality an epistle from the Council of Sardica, a council which was, for the reasons we shall presently state, entirely composed of Bishops favourable to Rome, all others having departed from it. Dr. Geraghty, who never seems to trouble himself with looking at the original writers, we suppose was deceived by some one who, finding the words referred to in a copy of an epistle given at the close of St. Hilary's works, ignorantly supposed that it must be an epistle of St. Hilary's. If he had taken the trouble to read the whole document as given in the Bened. ed., p. 1290, Paris 1693, he must have seen that it was what we have stated, though preserved among the fragments of an historical work of St. Hilary's; or if he had consulted Cardinal Baronius, tom. iii. p. 593, ad. An. 347, n. 23, he would have found the whole document, with its proper title, "Exemplar Epistolæ Synodi Sardicensis factæ ad Julium urbis Romæ Episcopum," showing that St. Hilary had nothing to do with it. We shall presently have occasion to show, in reply to another paragraph, XX, that the Council of Sardica was never treated as a General Council, or recognized as of authority by the Universal Church.

XIX. Dr. G. is inaccurate here, both in his reference

and his translation. The passage is not in lib. 16 of Ammanius Marcellinus, but in lib. 15, c. 7, and the writer does not say a word about authority over all other Bishops. He treats Athanasius as already condemned, and that Constantius knew it; but says that he wished his condemnation to be confirmed by the authority of the Bishop of the Eternal City.⁴ That the Bishops of Rome were then very powerful, and, on account of their position in the metropolis of the world, admittedly held the first place, we have always admitted; and it is not surprising that in the struggle then going on between the Arians and Athanasians, the Emperor, who was an Arian, was most anxious to have Pope Liberius on his side; and we may believe that this was quite true and most natural, without at all supposing that the Bishop of Rome had any power to settle the controversy, which, all history proves, he had not. It was for not immediately yielding to the Emperor's mandate that Liberius was sent into exile, from which he afterwards escaped by subscribing to the Arian creed drawn up at Sirmium.

XX. So far was the Council at Sardica, A.D. 347, from being a general one, that the Oriental Bishops altogether withdrew from it, and its canons were never received as binding on the Catholic Church, though, as we have seen in a former article (supra pp. 2, 3), they were attempted by Popes Zozimus and Boniface to be foisted on the African Church, under the colour of being canons of the General Council of Nice. Dupin's account of it contains the following passage:—"The Emperors Constantius and Constans, desiring to restore peace to the Church, called a synod of the eastern and western Bishops at Sardica, in the year 347. Thither came 100 Bishops from the West and 73 Bishops from the East; but those of the East having declared to those of the West that they would not be present at the Council unless St. Athanasius, Marcellus, and the other Bishops that were condemned, were excluded from ecclesiastical communion, and the western Bishops refusing to accept of this condition, the Council was divided, and the eastern Bishops withdrew. Those of the west, of whom Hosius was the head and president, did, notwithstanding, hold a synod in their absence, to treat of the faith, and of the accusations charged upon St. Athanasius and the other Catholic Bishops, and to make canons concerning the discipline of the Church. . . . On the other side the Eastern Bishops assembled at Philippolis, and excommunicated Hosius, Julius, and several others, and wrote a letter, in which they accused the Bishops of the West of arrogance, for endeavouring to establish a new law, to give themselves the liberty of examining anew what had been determined in the east. . . . The canons of the Council of Sardica were never received by the Catholic Church as general laws. They were never put into the code of the Universal Church, approved by the Council of Chalcedon. The East never received them, neither would the Bishops of Africa own them. The Popes only used them and cited them under the name of the Council of Nice, to give them greater weight and authority."⁵

XXI. There is, perhaps, no ancient writer whose text has been so much corrupted as St. Optatus. Balduinus made some corrections in his editions of 1563 and 1569. Commelinus did the like in 1599. Casaubon in 1631 published his edition, with critical notes; and Alaspineus his in the same year. "After so many editions and commentaries," says Dupin (Eccl. Hist., vol. i, p. 212), "one would think that this author were become most correct and plain, and yet 'tis not so, for the text is still very much corrupted." Dupin himself, subsequently, in 1702, did his best to correct the text of Optatus; but the difficulty of the task rendered it all but impossible to do it with such certainty as to render it safe to trust to its language in matters of controversy. The very passage cited by Dr. Geraghty is a proof of this. Dr. G. cites it as if the words were, the chair "in which now sits Damasus." But the words of Optatus are not so; but, "in which now sits Siricius" (hodie quinquagesimæ Siricius), though it is generally believed by the learned, including Dupin, that Optatus wrote this book about A.D. 370, whereas Siricius did not become Bishop of Rome before A.D. 383, and, consequently, this paragraph about Siricius must have been interpolated afterwards. The 7th book is generally given up as spurious, and the passage relied on (if genuine) from the 2nd book against the Donatist Bishop Parmenianus, while it magnifies the See of Rome as founded by St. Peter, and, as in some sense, a centre of unity, is far from asserting or establishing that it was by the authority or power of Damasus (or Siricius) that such unity was preserved; it merely shows that he was the instrument or medium of communication between the Churches, through whom they were united in the same communion, keeping correspondence by circular letters.

XXII. Pope Damasus, no doubt, was as anxious as other Popes to convert his precedency of honour into a superiority of power; yet, what more did his claim amount to than this, that he sought to be consulted? The value of a Pope's assertion as to a custom in his own favour we have already seen in Pope Julius's case—paragraph xiv., supra.

¹ Id enim ille (Constantius) Athanasio semper infestus, licet acriter impetum, tamen auctoritate quæque, quæ potiores æternæ urbis Episcopi, Armari desiderio pitebatur ardente. Valerius' edition, Paris, 1641, p. 92. Gronovius' edition, Lugdun, 1693, p. 70.

² Dupin's Eccl. Hist., vol. i, pp. 171, 603, 606, 607.

³ Dupin's Optatus, p. 32, Antw. 1702.

¹ Epist. iv.

² Mansi, iii. 458. Edition 1759-98.

³ Theodoret, Lib. v. c. 9.

⁴ Ibid. c. 10.

⁵ Ibid. c. 23.

⁶ Nam si omnino, ut dicitis, aliquis fuit eorum culpa oportuit juxta Ecclesiasticum canonem, et non eo pacto, rem judicari; oportuit omnibus nobis rescribere ut ita ab omnibus, quod justum esset decerneretur. Episcopi enim erant qui patiebantur, nec vulgares Ecclesiæ vexatæ sunt, sed quæ ipsi Apostoli per se gubernarent. Cur autem de Alexandria potissimum ecclesiæ, nihil nobis scriptum est? An ignoratis, hanc esse consuetudinem, ut primum nobis scribatur, et hinc quod justum est decerneretur? Sane si quæ hujusmodi suspicio in illius urbis episcopum cadebat, ad hanc ecclesiâ illud rescribendum fuit. Athanas. Opera tom. i. p. 153. Ben. ed. Paris 1698.

¹ Dupin De Antiqua Discipl. Eccl., p. 158, Diss. II., s. 2—"Athanasius Romanam confugit non quasi appellatus, sed vim hostium metuens."

² "Julius, cum esset a partibus judæ electus, potuit Eusebianos ad se vocare, et detrectantes dammare ac Athanasium absolvere."—Ibid.

³ "Neutrum tamen fecit nec ullum judicium tulit, sed tantum auditū ejusdem Athanasii Apologiam suam cum eo communionem confirmavit et pro Episcopo eum habuit. Hoc enim unum fecit; imo non solum fecit, sed Concilium quod ex de canis congregarat ad preces Eusebianorum. Censat id ex litteris Julii apud Athanasium, in quibus Julius enarrans ea omnia quæ se suoque Concilio pro Athanasio gesta fuerant, nullatenus dicit eum esse restitutum, sed tantum servatum cum eo communionem eumque pro Episcopo habuit. Verba hæc ipsa sunt hujus Epistolæ."—Ibid.

XXIII. It would not be very surprising if a Council held at Rome should have held the sanction of the Bishop of Rome necessary, especially where the circumstances of the Council of Ariminum are known. The Council of Ariminum, in Umbria, was convened by the Arian Emperor, Constantius, in 359, after he had banished Liberius, Bishop of Rome, because he would not concur in the excommunication of Athanasius. After two years exile at Berea, in Thrace, Liberius, no doubt, consented to sign the Arian creed; but after the death of Constantius in 361, and Liberius in 366, the cause of Arianism languished in the West, and it is not surprising that the Council at Rome under Damasus, in 369, refused to abide by the Arian Council of Ariminum. The passage, however, from the Roman Council in 369, does not refer solely to the want of the sanction of the Roman Bishop, but also to the want of consent of *Vicentius* and others also; which deprives the argument of any force whatever.

XXIV. Nothing can be more delusive than fixing upon an isolated expression in a long letter, and ignoring the rest. So far from this synodical letter being addressed by the Bishops of Constantinople to Damasus, as by sons to a father, it all through assumes the tone and style of equality. It was addressed, as Theodoret (in loco citato) tells us, "To our most honoured lords and most reverend brethren and fellow ministers, Damasus, Ambrose, Brittonius, Valerian, &c.," (not to "our holy father Pope Damasus," as Dr. Geraghty would insinuate). The passage from which Dr. G. quotes these words runs thus: "You have manifested to us your brotherly love, as is signified in the letters of your most pious Emperor, by inviting us to attend, as if domestic members," at the Council which you intend, according to the will of God, to hold in Rome, in order that, as we alone had to struggle with affliction, you may not reign alone, now that the Emperors are of one accord in religion; but that, to use the expression of the Apostle, we may reign with you."

The close of this epistle is a remarkable one, and shows how little idea these Bishops had of considering Rome as the mother and mistress of all Churches. "We must apprise you that the revered and pious Cyril is Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem, which is the mother of all Churches; that he was ordained according to law by the Bishops of the province, and that he has in various places withstood the Arians. We beseech you to rejoice with us that these Bishops have been ordained in a manner so strictly in accordance with the canon, and we entreat you to be united, to them by spiritual love and by the fear of the Lord, which represses human passions, and which causes us to attach more importance to the edification of the Church than to the love or sympathy of any creature. When we have come to one mind respecting the doctrines of faith, and when Christian love is established between us, we shall cease from saying what the Apostle condemns, 'I am of Paul. I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas.' We shall all be of Christ, who will not be divided in us; but, by God's help, we shall preserve the oneness of the body of the Church, and shall stand with confidence before the tribunal of the Lord."

XXV. How Dr. G. could have ventured to refer to Theodoret, lib. v., c. 23, as proving that Damasus showed his supremacy in deposing Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, is really surprising; and shows not only that he takes his statements at second hand, but from writers of either great ignorance or great carelessness. Theodoret, indeed, gives an account of the dispute between Flavian, Bishop of Antioch, and the Bishops of the west concerning Paulinus, A.D. 381; but there is nothing in it giving the least colour to the above assertion. Theodoret tells us "that the Romans and the Egyptians endeavoured to prejudice the Emperor against Flavian. Wearied by their importunity, the Emperor at length sent to Constantinople to summon Flavian to Rome. Flavian excused himself on account of its being winter, and promised to obey the Emperor's command the ensuing spring. He then returned to his native country. The Bishops of Rome, among whom was not only the admirable Damasus, but also Siricius, who afterwards succeeded him, as well as Anastasius, the successor of Siricius, rebuked the pious Emperor, and told him, that while he expressed the attempts of those who rose up against his own authority, he suffered those who insulted the laws of Christ to exercise the authority which they had usurped. The Emperor, therefore, sent again to compel Flavian to repair to Rome. To this mandate the wise Bishop replied, with great boldness of speech, saying—"If any individuals, oh Emperor, should accuse me of heterodoxy, or should say that my life is derogatory to the episcopal dignity, I would permit my accusers to be my judges, and would submit to whatever sentence they might pronounce. But if it be only as to my right to my episcopal chair and office that they are contending, I shall not contend for any claims, but shall relinquish my seat to whoever may be appointed to take it. Give, then, oh Emperor, the bishopric of Antioch to whomsoever you please." The Emperor admired his courage and wisdom, and sent to command him to resume the government of his Church. Some time after the

Emperor returned to Rome, and the Bishops again reproached him for not having suppressed the tyranny of Flavian. The Emperor replied by asking what species of tyranny had been exercised by Flavian, and declared his readiness to prohibit it. The Bishops replying that they would not litigate any point against an emperor, he exhorted them to be reconciled with each other, and to terminate the foolish contention; for Paulinus had died long previously, and Evagrius had been illegally ordained. Besides, the Eastern Churches acknowledged the supremacy of Flavian; all the Churches of Asia, of Pontus, and of Thrace were united with him in communion; and all the Churches of Illyria looked upon him as the Primate of the East. The Bishops of the West were convinced by these representations, and promised to lay aside their hostility, and to receive an embassy from Flavian. Flavian therefore, sent Acacius Bishop of Berea, and others to Rome. On his arrival with the others at Rome he terminated his lengthened hostility of seventeen years and restored peace to the Church."—Lib. v. c. 23.

This is Theodoret's account, and as unlike, as it is well possible, an assertion that Damasus exercised or claimed any such power as that of deposing a Patriarch of Constantinople; and yet Dr. Geraghty coolly asserts that "this Pope (Damasus) further showed his supremacy in deposing Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople," and cites Theodoret, lib. v., c. 23, as his sole authority for the assertion.

PETER'S INHERITANCE AND PETER'S CHAIR. TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR,—All lovers of truth and courtesy must congratulate you on the result of your discussion with Dr. Geraghty; for in both you have proved *facile princeps*. You have, indeed, so confounded the learned Dr. by the sheer force of truth, that he quite forgets he has an infallible Church to guide him, and wanders into the region of probability, with only his own private judgment to enlighten him. He declares that (after all his dogmatism) it is a matter of opinion among Roman Catholics what the true foundation of the Church is: it may be Peter or his faith, or Christ, or all three may be involved in it, which last, in Dr. Geraghty's judgment, is most likely, so that it is only a weighing of probabilities as to which is the true foundation in the Church of Rome; and Dr. Geraghty's private judgment it is that decides for him which is the most likely hypothesis. Verily, but for the name, he might as well be without an infallible Church, if that is all the certainty he can have on so vital a point, and we surely may be allowed the use of our private judgment also, and it ought not to offend such a consistent reasoner as Dr. Geraghty, if we say that we think Christ is the most likely foundation for the Church He has purchased with His own blood.

But the reason I intrude upon you, sir, is, not that I can add anything to the complete answer you have given to all Dr. G.'s arguments, but to seek for information which, perhaps, Dr. G. may be able to give. I want to know what the modern Church of Rome has to do with the statement of St. Cyprian, that "they have not Peter's inheritance who have not Peter's chair?" Dr. G. seems to think that this settles the question for him; but as it seems to me to be the strongest statement that can be made adverse to Romanism, and favourable to the principles of the Reformation, I am quite at a loss to discover the grounds of Dr. G.'s exultation. He does not, I presume, take chair literally—he does not mean by it that article of furniture so called at Rome, which recent investigation has discovered to be the inheritance of Mahomet rather than of Peter.

"Peter's chair" must mean the same as "Moses' seat" (Mat. xxiii. 2). The Scribes are said to "sit in Moses' seat" because they taught men to "observe and do" what Moses commanded. And so men are said to have "chairs" of different sciences in our universities who teach the sciences of their respective chairs.

To have Peter's chair must have the same meaning—they have "Peter's chair" who teach Peter's doctrine. I ask, then, has the Church of Rome Peter's chair? Does she teach Peter's doctrines? If Dr. G. can prove she does, there would be no further controversy on the point; we would bow at once to Peter's chair, or we should, indeed, forfeit Peter's inheritance; for to Peter, I believe, was given the high and blessed office of preaching the Gospel of Christ, and making known the terms of salvation. He was the first confessor of the truth that saves the soul—the first living stone of the Church Christ was going to build—the first *πῆρα* of the *πέτρα*. That was the foundation on which none other was or could be laid—Christ Jesus (1 Cor. iii. 11), and he was rewarded for his pre-eminence in the confession of that true faith by being made the first preacher of it—to him the glorious commission was given. "I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth shall be loosed in heaven" (Mat. xvi. 19). And did not Peter fulfil this commission, when, by preaching the Gospel of Christ, he opened the kingdom of heaven to the Jews, first on the day of Pentecost, when 3,000 souls were made the heirs of the kingdom of heaven, and also to the Gentiles, when he was sent for this special purpose to Cornelius (Acts x. 2)?

Did he not then, too, do what Christ gave him power and authority to do? Did he not loose the Jews from the yoke that neither they nor their fathers were able to bear, that burdensome law of commandments contained in ordinances, from which none could loose them save one commissioned from heaven, as Peter was? And did he not loose the Gentiles too, from their hopeless superstitions, from their exclusion from God's grace and covenant, and open for them the kingdom of God's elect Church, from which they had hitherto been aliens? (Eph. ii. 12, 22.) Thus did Peter fulfil his Lord's commission and loose both Jews and Gentiles from their respective bondage; and what he has loosed has been loosed in heaven, as all the Apostles testify. He was commissioned to bind, too; and so we find him binding those he loosed: he bound them to the easy and light yoke of Christ. He bound them to the truth that "there is no other name under heaven from among men whereby we must be saved" (Acts iv., 11, 12). He bound men thus to believe and obey the Gospel; he loosed them from the bondage of Jewish ceremonial and bigotry, and pagan superstition, that he might bind them to the faith and service of Christ. This was Peter's office—Peter's chair—to make known to the slaves of ignorance, and vice, and carnal ordinances the grace and truth of Jesus, and the liberty wherewith He hath made us free. This he himself declared to be the chair to which God had appointed him (Acts xv., 7-11). Has Rome this chair? Does she use Peter's keys? Does she preach that only name given under heaven that can save the soul, and set at liberty them that are bound? Does she bind them heart and soul to the service of Christ and His righteousness? (Rom. vi., 17, 18.) Alas, no. She reverses the acts of Peter: she takes away his keys from men (Comp. Luke xi., 52). She rescinds his decrees, given in solemn council of the Church, which bound Apostles (Acts xv., 14), and should bind us. She binds again the yoke of Jewish ordinances and pagan superstitions, and makes of the twain her new system, from which Peter "loosed" men, and which has been "loosed in heaven." And she looses them from the single faith working by love, which Peter bound upon all that will be saved, and which has been bound in heaven.

And she it is that boasts of Peter's chair! As well may Mahomedanism boast that it is the chair of Asia's Seven Churches. The Churches of England and Ireland have established here the chair of Peter; they teach his doctrines; they repeat his protest (Acts xv. 10) against a yoke from which Christ, by the mouth of Peter, has set us free, and which Rome re-binds. We thank God, therefore, we have Peter's inheritance; we have the glorious liberty of the children of God, and rejoice in the hope of the glory of God, which faith in the Son of God secures to us. This seems to me so evident that I am at a loss to know what claim Dr. G. can make to Peter's chair or Peter's inheritance. Let him but prove his claim; let him but point us to the inheritance of Peter's teaching, and we submit. Let but the Pope send his encyclical letter to all bishops and priests of his communion to preach the doctrine Peter preached, to loose men from the yoke Peter loosed us from, and to bind only on men's consciences the one thing needful that Peter bound, and he will exterminate all Protestants. Let him teach even what the Popes of Cyprian's time taught, and we will pay him the deference Cyprian did; though we will reserve to ourselves the liberty St. Cyprian resigned not—of protesting against anything he may propound that may be contrary to the chair of Peter.

I am, dear sir, faithfully yours, C. J. M.

SACRAMENTAL WAFERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR,—On reading in the CATHOLIC LAYMAN for August, "Practices of the Ancient Church," I find an inaccuracy at page 88, which I am sure the writer of that article will excuse me for pointing out to him. The "little round wafers," the sacramental bread, he says, "they (the priests) never break them for distribution." This is incorrect, I know to the contrary, having seen the consecrated wafers broken, and distributed to persons communicating. This is likely to occur frequently in large and populous towns, especially during the "Easter indulgence," when every Roman Catholic is expected, as he is commanded, to present himself at the communion table under pain of mortal sin. In numerous congregations it is impossible for the priest to calculate on the number of communicants that may present themselves at his mass, and although he may have consecrated an extra number of wafers, expecting a large number of communicants, still they may fall short of the number required, in that case, the priest seeing that the "hosts" are likely to fall short, he breaks them and distributes them in halves or smaller portions, and so distributes them; where this is not done, the communicants, in case of a deficiency of "hosts," would be deprived of the sacrament, and obliged to present themselves on another occasion. The priest himself, when he communicates at his mass, breaks the consecrated bread before putting it into his mouth.—Your obedient servant, T. E.

[We feel obliged to our correspondent for the correction of an unconscious inaccuracy, though it is in a matter of no moment to our argument. The ordinary practice is as we stated.]

¹ The words are, "Neque enim prejudicium agere nasci potuit ex numero eorum, qui apud Ariminum conveniunt; cum constat, neque Romanum Episcopum cuius ante omnes ita expectanda sententia, neque Vicentium, qui tot annos sacerdotis infatigabilem servavit, neque alios huiusmodi statutis concessum aliquem emendasse."

² Theodoret, Paris ed., 1642, p. 715, (ὁμοκίττα μέλη).